NOVEMBER 1964

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 16
7

THE TRIPLE REVOLUTION

THE EDITORS

BEYOND AUTOMATION

GEORGE AND LOUISE CROWLEY

Today's Messiah LEOPOLDO ARAGON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME SIXTEEN NUMBER SEVEN NOVEMBER 1964

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Triple Revolution 417
BEYOND AUTOMATION by George and Louise Crowley 423
AGRARIAN "REFORM" IN SOUTH VIETNAM by Richard Morrock 442
THE COLONIAL WAR AT HOME by H. W. Edwards 447
TODAY'S MESSIAH by Leopoldo Aragon 453
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 456

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright ©1964, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $9; everywhere else $11.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Our apologies to our readers for the lateness of the October issue. Ordinarily, we come out on the 1st of each month, but in October we were 16 days late. The fault was not ours nor the printer's—it was the binder who was delayed because it was a 96-page number with a sewn instead of a staple binding. We will be back on schedule again with this issue and you can expect to get your copies on time in the future.

The number of copies printed is generally the biggest factor in the determination of the cost of a book. The 50¢ paperback can be sold at that amazingly low price only because the press run of such a title is usually numbered in the hundreds of thousands. Quality paperbacks, whose appeal is to a limited audience of intellectuals rather than to the mass, generally have a press run numbering only in the thousands—and their list price, therefore, has been going up steadily until they begin to cost what cloth-bound books sold for a few years ago. Most MR Press books do not sell in large enough quantities to be put out as paperbacks and their list price is usually as high as those of other publishers.

However, because the MR Press book operation is intertwined with the magazine, we have succeeded, over the years, in offering our books to our special audience of Monthly Review readers at very reduced prices. We do that in three different ways: (1) Through offering new books at a

(continued on inside back cover)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRIPLE REVOLUTION

"The Triple Revolution," a document published last spring by a distinguished group calling itself the Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution, has attracted a great deal of attention and discussion in the most varied quarters. We had intended from the beginning to participate in this controversy, but what seemed the greater urgency of more topical problems plus certain commitments which obliged us to omit all editorial comment from the July-August and October issues, have prevented us from doing so until now. We are not sorry for the delay. It has enabled us to inaugurate discussion of the themes introduced by "The Triple Revolution" with one of the most provocative essays we have been privileged to publish in these pages—"Beyond Automation" by George and Louise Crowley which begins on page 423 below.

We are inviting a number of people, including signers of the original triple revolution document, to comment on the Crowley article, and we take this method of extending the invitation to any MR readers who are stimulated by it to put their thoughts on paper. At a later stage, we shall survey the contributions, both published and unpublished, and attempt an assessment of the state of the debate. In the meantime, since the Crowleys take for granted a certain familiarity with "The Triple Revolution," it may be useful to present the gist of that document as we understand it, together with a critique, from a socialist point of view, of its main proposition.

The three strands of the triple revolution, according to the Ad Hoc Committee, are the "Cybernation Revolution," the "Weaponry Revolution," and the "Human Rights Revolution." The first is increasing productive capacity to an almost unlimited degree and doing away with the need for human labor. The second has already eliminated war as a method of settling international conflicts. And the third is a world-wide movement for social and racial equality. Taken together, they demand radical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changes in attitudes, policies, and institutions. "The Triple Revolution" concentrates on the Cybernation Revolution as being, in the United States context, the strategically decisive variable in the process as a whole.

The crux of the matter is that, in the American system, incomes and hence the power to consume are tied to jobs, while cybernation and automation are rapidly eliminating jobs. The result is that more and more people are being deprived of the power to consume. This is the origin of poverty in the midst of affluence. It hits Negroes particularly hard, and it is bound to get worse as the pace of cybernation is stepped up and the prop to the economy provided by arms spending is weakened under the impact of growing recognition that war is no longer an acceptable method of settling international conflicts. "The continuance of the income-through-jobs link as the only major mechanism for distributing effective demand—for granting the right to consume—now acts as the main brake on the almost unlimited capacity of a cybernated productive capacity."

This being the case, it follows that the most important needed reform is to abolish the income-through-jobs link and substitute for it an "unqualified commitment to provide every individual and every family with an adequate income as a matter of right." This, the Ad Hoc Committee believes, "will prove to have been only the first step in the reconstruction of the value system of our society brought on by the triple revolution." In the long run, drastically new patterns of attitude and behavior will certainly emerge. In this process, extensive planning at all levels for the welfare of the people, under full democratic control, will necessarily play a key role.

These basic changes, the Committee recognizes, will not be completed overnight. Hence it proposes a series of "transitional" measures of a kind which have come to be associated with the New Deal and the Welfare State. "These suggestions . . . contemplate expenditures of several billions more each year than are now being spent for socially rewarding enterprises, and a larger role for the government in the economy than it has now or has been given except in time of crisis."*

* Two members of the Committee, James Boggs and Robert Theobald,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The foregoing is of course a much abbreviated and simplified version of the message of "The Triple Revolution," but we believe that it states what is essential for our present purpose, which is to articulate a socialist critique of the document. For this what is needed is not stress on its eloquent indictment of this country's present sorry condition: no socialist could disagree with this aspect of "The Triple Revolution." What is needed is to be perfectly clear about the Committee's analysis of the *causes* of this condition, which, as we have seen, it finds in the breakdown of the income-through-jobs link under the impact of rapid cybernation.

In order to draw the real issue as sharply as possible, we assert without qualification that this is *not* the root of the difficulty. The distribution of income and the maintenance of consumption, individually and collectively, are problems which can, in principle, be solved without in any way disturbing the income-through-jobs link, except of course for the aged, disabled, etc.—but they have always been exceptions so we can ignore them here. This could be proved for an idealized competitive capitalism such as is, or used to be, dear to the hearts of orthodox economists, but the case is at best far removed from reality and of small practical relevance. Let us therefore consider the case of a fully planned socialist economy which distributes income—again, to all except those unable to work—as wages or salaries to employed workers. The question is: does this method break down when automation and cybernation become the order of the day?

The answer is, certainly not. Cybernation means, as the Ad Hoc Committee recognizes, an exceptionally fast increase in the productivity of labor, or, looked at the other way around, an exceptionally fast reduction in the costs of production. If prices remain unchanged, "profits," which in the socialist economy accrue to the state and not to private corporations and individuals, grow correspondingly. The state, acting through the planning authority, must decide what to do with its swelling income. There are three possibilities: First, the state can step up

---

dissented from this concept of the "transition," arguing, entirely logically it seems to us, that the Committee's proposals "are more suitable for meeting the problems of the scarcity-economic system than for advancing through the period of transition into the period of abundance."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

investment, a course which will accelerate the rate of cybernation, raise labor productivity even more rapidly, and still further increase the state's income in the future. Second, the state can expand collective consumption—education, health care, conservation, the arts, etc.—giving jobs in these fields to people released from material production. And third, the state can cut prices, thus enhancing the purchasing power of individual consumers and reducing its own income in the future. These policies are of course not mutually exclusive, and it is obvious that the appropriate mix would depend on many factors, but particularly on the stage of development already attained. As the process of cybernation advances, it would be logical to expect a diminishing emphasis on investment with a correspondingly more rapid increase in collective and individual consumption. If we can imagine the production process becoming completely automated—that is, employing no labor at all—we can also imagine everyone being employed performing services for each other and for the collectivity. If it be said that this would result in "overproduction" of services, the remedy is simple: reduce working time—for example, let everyone work half the year and have the other half for rest, travel, study, etc.

To avoid misunderstanding, we should add here that there is no implication that incomes *must* be paid only for work done. People *might,* if it seemed desirable, be paid for doing nothing or, say, for going to school (though going to school could easily be defined as a form of useful work). The point is simply that under no conceivable circumstances is there any reason why the income-through-jobs link has to break down in a socialist society. There are people—and we count ourselves among them—who are glad that this is so. We think that there is something esthetically satisfying and morally worthy about work so long as the results are positive and meaningful in social and human terms. But that is another story, perhaps better left for the discussion which we hope the Crowley article will stimulate. For the moment we are concerned with "The Triple Revolution."

If the Ad Hoc Committee is wrong in identifying the income-through-jobs link as the villain of the piece, what is it about our present economic system which produces the dire consequences the Committee so convincingly describes? Why does cybernation,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which should make possible abundance for all, in fact produce unemployment and poverty and suffering for so many? These questions can best be answered if we compare our situation to that of the socialist state which we have already analyzed. There, it will be remembered, "profits" were essentially a form of state income to be spent in accordance with a rational plan or, if that should seem wiser, to be reduced by the simple expedient of cutting prices. So long as these crucial variables are under effective social control, there need never be any question of shortages of effective demand or lack of jobs for people able to work. And this points straight at what is wrong under capitalism: these variables are *not* under effective social control. Profits are the income of private individuals and groups. These profit-receivers *will* always seek to maximize their returns—indeed, they *must* do so by the very logic of the situation they find themselves in; they will always use their profits to increase their wealth, to enhance their command over goods and services, to expand their power over their fellows. Under these conditions, there is no mechanism for securing a socially rational utilization of profits and no way to bring about a lowering of prices which would reduce the amount of profits.

What actually happens is complicated; its elucidation may even be said to be the central task of economic science. But at the level of generality to which this analysis must necessarily be confined, we can paint the main contours of the process with a few broad strokes. The American economy is wholly dominated by a few hundred giant monopolistic corporations. These giants set prices to maximize profits and then concentrate their energies on cutting costs so that each successive year's maximum profits will be greater than the last year's. Given today's technologies—which the giant corporations, directly and through their control over government, have a major share in molding—this process involves the progressive elimination of human labor from the productive system. But the income which might employ the displaced workers elsewhere is only partly used for that purpose—and that mostly in wasteful and destructive ways. For the rest it serves, via investment, to speed up still more the rate of displacement, or it is used by the giant corporations to increase their liquid assets and/or to buy up the securities of smaller

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

corporations—in either case strengthening the stranglehold of the giants over the whole system and providing employment for no more than a handful of brokers, financiers, tax lawyers, and such like parasites. The net result is an accumulation of wealth, power, and privilege at one pole and of unemployment, poverty, and misery at the other.

Returning now to the analysis of "The Triple Revolution," we see that while under capitalism the income-through-jobs link is increasingly shattered by cybernation-for-profit, this link is in no sense the *cause* of the trouble. The cause is rather the control and use of society's surplus product, alias profits, by private persons and groups for private ends. And this arrangement of course rests on the foundation of private ownership of the means of production.

It is against this background that one must evaluate the central proposal of "The Triple Revolution," that society should guarantee to all an adequate income regardless of whether they work or not. The authors see this guaranteed income as taking the place of what they call the patchwork of welfare measures designed to ensure that no one shall actually starve, and they believe that its enactment will inaugurate an era of social and moral regeneration. If the proposal is addressed to the oligarchy which now controls the surplus out of which these guaranteed incomes would have to be paid, its acceptance, we fear, would have a different meaning and different consequences. It would be a streamlining of the present patchwork of welfare measures, not a replacement of them. And far from inaugurating an era of regeneration, it would merely tend to dull the sense of anger and outrage which is the natural human reaction to a society as corrupt and shameful as ours, and which we can at least hope is the harbinger of a genuinely revolutionary movement to come.

Our conclusion can only be that the idea of unconditionally guaranteed incomes is not the great revolutionary principle which the authors of "The Triple Revolution" evidently believe it to be. If applied under our present system, it would be, like religion, an opiate of the people tending to strengthen the status quo. And under a socialist system, as we argued above, it would be quite unnecessary and might do more harm than good.

We intend no blanket condemnation of "The Triple Revolu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion." We are convinced that on balance its influence has been strongly positive. But the poorest compliment we could pay it would be uncritical praise. And above all we must insist that its authors have discovered no new formula for, or road to, a better society. The triple revolution only makes more urgent than ever the substitution of public for private ownership of the means of production. (October 5, 1964)

BEYOND AUTOMATION

BY GEORGE AND LOUISE CROWLEY

We agree essentially with the analysis of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution, as stated in its memorandum to President Johnson. That memorandum holds explicitly that cybernation invalidates the traditional methods by which society's wealth is distributed. Implicit in the Committee's report is the thesis that our present economic and social system (read capitalism) is now facing breakdown through a deepening paradox: income, hence consumption, hinges on employment; while accelerating productivity with all its potential of abundance, hinges on the very opposite—elimination of human labor. This paradox cannot be resolved within capitalism's distributive framework of wage labor.

We submit, however, that the cybernation revolution poses an impasse for socialists also: it presents us with nothing less than the liquidation of the working class as a significant component of society. When human industrial labor is obsolescent,

The Crowleys have been active for many years in the left-wing movement in Seattle.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to project a worker's state becomes an anachronism. It has long been the essence of our philosophy as Marxists to believe that economic developments stimulate appropriate changes in the organization of society. The Industrial Revolution triggered the rise of socialism; the cybernation revolution calls for something beyond it, which as yet has no accepted name.

It is not communism. The abundant society cybernation makes possible eliminates need for social constraint, including the constraint to produce according to one's abilities. It points instead to the freest conceivable exercise of individual option in production and consumption as in all human activities. It points away from private ownership of the means of production, but not toward their collective ownership; rather, it suggests that the fully automated productive complex, operating independently to supply whatever people may demand of it, needs no ownership nor management at all. Who owns the air?

If this be anarchy, it is anarchy of an altogether new type stripped of its own nostalgia for primitive communism. If it be utopian, it looks toward a hitherto unimaginable kind of utopia: a variform utopia of ultimate technology, in which men and women, freed from all compulsion to wrest their livelihood from a given environment, may live their lives as they desire in milieux of their own choosing.

We assume the beneficence of freedom from toil, and therefore assert that our efforts should be directed toward the speediest development and broadest application of automation. As the Ad Hoc Committee stated, it is the income-through-jobs link that acts as the main brake on the capacity of a cybernated productive system. This link must be broken. The traditional dictum (however modified) that he who does not work shall not eat is postulated on an economy of scarcity, in which the labor of all is needed to sustain the community. In the United States at least, current levels of productivity have invalidated it even in terms of the present system. The income-reducing aspects of capitalist automation cannot and should not be countered by finger-in-the-dyke attempts to hold on to existing jobs and to create others. Such efforts can only delay the advent of a desirable new state of society, while little alleviating the misery inherent in the old. It is not jobs that are needed for the transition, but income.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Capitalism can accept—indeed, has in significant measure already accepted—breaking the linkage of income to employment. To provide everyone with an adequate income as a matter of right would of itself deal no deathblow to the system. Intelligent proponents of capitalism could even find virtue in thus cushioning the shock of technological displacement for millions of quondam workers. Yet it would rupture a critical strand in the fetters that precariously restrain the genie of cybernation, who even now, with tied hands, has begun to lay the economic foundation of the new society.

Mark I, Univacs I through VI, and Eniac, those first ponderous monsters, solved the manifold logistic problems of the Second World War and performed the calculations for the atomic and hydrogen bomb projects. Experience with these cooled vacuum-tube computers demonstrated that their speed and accuracy, unhampered by the limitations of the human nervous system, made feasible the solution of problems too complex to have been investigated with mechanical calculating devices.

The second stage of cybernation began with the introduction of small, low-voltage vacuum tubes that required no special cooling system nor elaborate controlled-temperature housing. The more versatile machines that resulted automated the big basic industries—steel, textile, petroleum, and chemicals—and broke the paperwork bottleneck in insurance, banking, and government. These accomplishments dispelled forever in the minds of those associated with production management the idea that automation was just another step in the slow rise of labor productivity. Early the lesson was learned: as automation progresses, it becomes imperative to get all of the people out of the way so that the machines may work at their own optimum speeds. The new Ford block plant at Cleveland has been so designed that much of its assembly line is inaccessible to people; it was the presence of a few workers that rendered its ten-year-old predecessor obsolete.

Application of transistors and block circuits introduced the current proliferation stage, which has unveiled the Frankenstein's monster. The new devices (they can hardly be called machines, for virtually all mechanical components have been eliminated) can be made in any size and complexity, from miniature systems for small shops and offices to the Bureau of Internal Revenue's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Big Brother which does the work of half a million people at a cost of less than twenty-five cents per man-year. Componentized and standardized, they can be custom assembled to any specifications. Built-in detector systems permit self-maintenance. Their reliability has brought precise quality (and obsolescence) control into mass-production industries. Communicating by telephone, a Minneapolis-Honeywell computer is capable not only of receiving six million bits of information per second, but of transmitting, over a different frequency, another six million at the same time. Such high-speed communication enables the otherwise prohibitive cost of complex systems to be spread over many users. If the average cost of all systems can be said now to have reached parity with that of hiring and equipping a human labor force, henceforth the scales will tip in automation's favor. As systems reach out for optimum workloads, they as eagerly assume the tasks of the doctor, lawyer, merchant, and chief as they did those of the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick-maker.

At this stage of the production revolution, all attempts to reclaim some of the lost jobs by featherbedding, reducing hours, etc., only serve to unleash new rounds of automation, as the delicate cost-balance shifts. Once a single plant in an industry has automated, the whole industry must follow suit to remain competitive. As Big Business automates, the anguished screams of smaller capitalists impel the state to subsidize their automation.

Reaction to the much-touted tax cut was the greatest shock of all. Official doctrine was that the higher profit ratio would relieve the urgency of automating, and would trickle down through more readily absorbed wage increases to improve mass consumption. Instead, something like 70 percent of the gain has gone into automation equipment. Since this equipment is itself made in automated plants, the expected trickle-down is simply bypassed.

So we stand, in the Ad Hoc Committee's words, "at a historic conjuncture which demands a fundamental re-examination of existing values and institutions." Not of existing values and institutions only, we add, but of all concepts postulated on a need for human labor—in short, re-examination of all hitherto conceived notions of society. Default or short-sightedness could mean congealment of the social order with a powerful oligarchy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still astride the means of production, decreeing through a new Dark Age the conditions under which the lumpenized mass of unwanted humanity may, or may not, be permitted to survive. This, while automation stands willing and potent to give all men the full fruit of mankind's age-long struggles, if only it be turned loose to do the job! Our imperative task is to formulate a realistic program to provide those conditions in which the new society can come most readily to fruition.

To do this we must consider in at least equal depth the implications of the other two coalescing movements. Fear engendered by the total destructiveness of nuclear weapons has obscured the nature of what the Ad Hoc Committee calls the Weaponry Revolution; actually it is a power revolution manifesting itself in the field of weaponry. We see latent in the demand for human equality an urge toward freedom from all dependence —from dependence on society as well as dependence on nature. The confluence of the three revolutions, all sweeping toward the same social transformation, is the force that can realize this freedom.

In its memorandum, the Ad Hoc Committee touched but briefly, and we think with mistaken emphasis, on the new weaponry. That no nation can "win" a war fought with nuclear, chemical, and organic weapons is to us a truism; and the futility of war is but its corollary. Without minimizing the need to get this point across to those who fail to see or to heed it, we submit that the multiplex body of scientific and technological progress, still largely contained within the military womb of the new weaponry, holds the momentous potential of freeing man's evolution from the limitations imposed by his earthly environment. Cybernation offers to remove only one portion of Adam's twofold curse; the new science in toto holds forth the prospect of lifting it altogether. Our view should not be narrowed by the dreadful fact that important areas of the current scientific revolution are being researched and developed with warlike intent. Cognizant of the ultimate capacity of the new weapons, we nevertheless prefer to speak of a Power Revolution.

Let us look at the long history of social change.

With the Neolithic Revolution, agriculture transformed the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic base of primitive society; signalizing the dawn of recorded history, the rise of commodity production brought about the profound social and political changes of the Urban Revolution. The formerly almost imperceptible progress of science and technology quickened, productivity growing apace, until toward the end of the Roman Republic the sophisticated culture that had developed stood ready to pass into the Industrial Revolution. Manufacturing and agriculture were producing at the saturation point for a slave society. In the Archimedean screw, the aeolipile, and the steam piston, means were at hand to utilize the understood power of water and steam. But only by emancipating the slaves to become free consumers could the Industrial Revolution have been consummated. This the skilled and powerful Roman ruling class was able to prevent. After an initial application of authoritarian control, it wrought the fixation of the individual's socio-economic position, blocking progress so effectively that Rome's own decay merely added to the general stagnation. Western Europe, still basically neolithic when conquered by Rome, and with no strong traditions of stable community life, defined social position in terms of individual to individual—man to master, and master to lord. Despite trappings of urban civilization, the self-sufficient feudal manor was essentially a neolithic village. Feudalism was thus a product not of revolution but of counter-revolution.

As Europe emerged slowly toward the threshold of its own belated urban revolution, the powerful Catholic Church (a most urbane institution) sought to control the movement and on the strength of a successful Holy War to establish temporal authority over a restabilized, more trade-centered Europe. The Crusades precipitated backward Europe into confrontation with a society in which the Industrial Revolution had long been overdue. Matters got out of hand. Returning crusaders brought back a pregnant ideology: the reintroduction of scientific inquiry and of applied technology, a cosmopolitan view of man and his institutions, and a taste for opulent living. Its fruit was the Protestant Reformation, the Renaissance, and the consummation in the form of mercantilism of Europe's suspended urbanization. The momentum of the movement carried Europe (with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

significant exception of the Iberian peninsula) into the Industrial Revolution.

We see operating here the same factors that brought socialism not to the mature industrial nations that seemed most ripe for it, but to only superficially capitalist societies.

Examining these factors, we are struck most forcibly with the strength and sophistication of a solidly grounded ruling class. Revolutionary theory is not the property of revolutionists alone; the ruling class has studied Marx far more profoundly than has the proletariat on which he based his hopes. By whatever maneuvers of force, concession, and guile, advanced capitalist states have countered every bid of the working class for power, while strengthening control over their own internal stresses. It is time to face up to the sobering realization that an over-ripe social order is by no means as vulnerable as Marxists have traditionally believed.

Nevertheless, compelling forces have transformed society and will transform it again. The three-fold nature of the current revolution brings their dynamics into sharper focus.

Each major social revolution has tapped previously unavailable sources of power. The Neolithic Revolution harnessed the muscle power of beasts; by providing institutions able to cope with human gang labor, the Urban Revolution made feasible the use on a large scale of slavery. With the Industrial Revolution man converted into torque the energy stored in fossil fuels, and applied it to an already advanced system of mechanized hand manufacture. This yoking of superior power to a body of cumulate technology touched off an explosive proliferation. Innovations burst upon society with institution-shattering force, and a process of metamorphosis got under way.

This is precisely the state of affairs we now see imminent. The abundant power attainable through control of nuclear events can catalyze just such a violent technological acceleration. Granting that the present cumbersome reactors work with true Rube Goldberg inefficiency to produce power by extremely uneconomical methods, we yet recall that ordinary aluminum, the most common metallic element in the earth's crust, was until 1886 the costliest of metals to produce. The breakthrough occurred when sufficient current became available to permit cheap electrolytic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extraction. Development of the MHD generator, shielding itself with its own magnetic field, may point a way toward breakthrough in the economic utilization of nuclear power.

Theoretically, nuclear power is incredibly cheap. Sources are literally infinite, and the nuclear generator consists potentially of only a relatively small conversion unit without moving parts, together with its appropriate switching gear. There will be no need for such massive paraphernalia, with attendant maintenance requirements, as is requisite to the generation and transmission of hydro-electric power.

We know little of what may already lie in abeyance, awaiting an abundance of cheap power to trigger innovations. The power-hunger of the laser beam, for example, has retarded even its obvious applications to industry and communications; but who can foretell the course of the laser's development, given ample power? And here is power in plenty—power to explore the universe, power to create the environments we desire. Here is the means to manipulate matter itself, even to establish balanced matter-energy cycles—the Philosopher's Stone, the Universal Solvent, and Perpetual Motion.

At just such a conjuncture of technology and potential power did the slaveholders of Rome relegate the aeolipile to parlor amusement and the steam piston to opening temple doors. For the nuclear generator our own rulers have prepared a far more ominous dustbin.

The impending union of cybernation with nuclear power threatens sudden and violent disruption to an economy already troubled by its decreasing ability to sell the goods it must produce. We see in the rise of the extreme Right a response to the threat. In the United States, reaction now strives to ride to power on the wave of the white backlash, but its underlying causes are deeper and more fundamental.

We do not believe, as a majority of the Ad Hoc Committee apparently does, that institutions geared to promoting the interests of the class in power will or can act for the greater good of all humanity. Certainly we do not expect them to manifest such altruism in a situation of conflicting interests and values. Governing bodies can but arrest the current revolution at an intermediate stage of its development and stabilize society in a new equilibrium

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(possibly minimizing disorder thereby, with less than optimum social benefit) or be themselves overwhelmed as the revolution sweeps to its consummation.

The dangers of a limited revolution are frightful and too little understood. The Ad Hoc Committee may prate about "planning agencies under democratic control," but the very folk-wisdom tells us by what forces our so-called democratic processes are dominated. We have no illusions about their plans; their plans will be those of the capitalist class. The present division in its ranks offers us not a lesser evil but a choice between equally abhorrent alternatives. Capitalism's "enlightened" wing, which sees advantage in social tranquility, may adopt what appears to be a favorable course. It may alleviate poverty; it may end racial discrimination; it may thaw the Cold War and cool off the hot ones; it may considerably reform the economic structure. If it does, it will do so only to secure a more placid population, more conformable to its control. Such expedients will not long be needed (though social habit may preserve them), for better means will soon be at hand. With the decipherment of the genetic code, the most terrifying nightmare of science fiction becomes the all-too-imminent probability: mankind can be stopped dead in its tracks, or its development can be permanently diverted into any direction the planners see fit. Reform thus becomes the means whereby automation's surplus production is used to impose paralysis. This cannot be shrugged off. Man's very capacity to rebel can be forever extinguished, as dissatisfaction is biologically eliminated from his prefabricated psychology. Whatever his existence he would be content, for he could be nothing else. It is to this fate that the primrose path of reform would lead us.

If replacement of purblind instinct with reasoned confrontation of environment is the prime direction of human evolution, then with each progressive transformation of society we see accelerated the humanization of *homo sapiens.* In transforming society he transforms himself, the more so as his responses grow more malleable to environmental conditioning, and as the relative importance of his social environment increases. To the pre-human who foraged and scavenged his meager subsistence in disadvan-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tageous competition with saber-toothed cats, the natural environment must have loomed all-important. It is unlikely that he gave much thought to his relationships with his fellow-scroungers, or that those relationships became at all complex until tool-making and pyrotechny transformed his conditions of life. We venture to guess that it was in a consequent amplification of gregariousness that speech developed the range and flexibility to become a serviceable instrument of communication.

It is difficult for us to imagine the psychology of that pre-toolmaking ancestor of ours. But after this earliest known transformation, we see developing traditions of toolmaking, socially transmitted and diffused techniques; we can trace community acceptance of new and improved designs. We view in a much more human light the social beings who shaped their flints into conventional laurel-leaf patterns. These are folk akin to us; they have evolved in our direction.

The man who emerged from the misnamed Neolithic Revolution was more human still: as he had become a farmer, he was by that much less a predator. Diminished predaciousness and the easier conditions of neolithic life opened up a new dimension in his conscious dealings with his environment. Hunting parties occasionally encountered each other in the forests and plains but so seldom that they could afford to settle their territorial conflict afresh with each encounter. If well-matched, they might fight it out on the spot; otherwise the weaker party might flee. Hunting populations were small, encounters rare, and territorial attachments slight, so such expedients served well enough. But men living in settled villages in fixed proximity had reason to seek more stable solutions. Abraham and Lot could put an end to their recurring conflicts by reasonably negotiating a mutually agreeable partition. Thus the neolithic milieu conduced to new concepts in people-to-people relationships, and provided the conditions to implement them. Agricultural work is cyclic, with periods of relative leisure between the time of sowing and the time of first cultivation, between the last cultivation and the harvest, and from harvest to the next year's sowing. Much of the new leisure must have been put to the exploration of interpersonal relations, for man had now come to conscious acceptance of his interdependence. In the climate of neolithic life, social interaction—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

derived from this concept—wrought the domestication of the species. In short, the Neolithic Revolution transformed *homo sapiens faber* into *homo sapiens domesticus.*

The Urban Revolution translated interdependence to subservience. More or less consciously, domestic man traded personal freedom for greater security. With the slaves read out of the human race, the application of their versatile labor power to productive techniques furnished mankind with fecund conditions to speed its development. In the affluent cities, the slave may have sunk to subhumanity, but the man became a citizen and a scholar.

When the harnessing of power obviated society's need to prune its work force from the body politic, the slaves at last made good their chronic demand for re-admission to the human race. The vindication of self they brought with them unfitted re-unified mankind for integration into progressively more ordered anthills. With the Industrial Revolution, man asserted his right to re-examine the concessions he had made to society. In capitalism's ruthless but sometimes rewarding competitiveness he became an individual, with impelling aspirations apart from the dictates of the social order.

Each revolution thus performs the human transformation that is prerequisite to the next revolution.

We suggest that the American Negro's drive for equality, insofar as it goes no further, is in essence a mop-up operation of the Industrial Revolution. If it were no more, an advanced industrial society could accede to it with little difficulty. But in the developing ideology and tactics of the Negro struggle here and of colonial movements elsewhere, we read a forecast of the next step in man's humanization. Its vanguard is the widespread and growing insistence upon peaceable solutions to human problems, and the emergence in significant force of people neither listless nor subservient who are capable of non-violent conduct in the face of clubs, cattleprods, and even bullets. That non-violent tactics may be suicidal in a violent society is here beside the point. These people prefigure those of the new society. If the current revolution is to be pushed beyond the possibility of containment, theirs are the demands that will push it.

We submit that herein lies the so-called "ripeness of the masses" for revolution. It occurs when the human transformation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has progressed to a point of no return at which its needs so exceed those of a limited economic revolution as to carry that revolution beyond itself and into the next.

If this be true, any given society at the breaking point is always, so to speak, one revolution behind the next impending revolution. Our examination of the revolutions, fulfilled and aborted, for which we have sufficient data, bears this out, and we are reminded of what we stated at the beginning: that in the United States the current revolution calls not for socialism but for something beyond it.

The coming change, as we see it, will bring man from a condition in which he can maintain society only through the coercive institutions of government and law to a state of humaneness wherein all such institutionalized constraints will become unnecessary and will vanish. The individual man has long found them irksome; his more or less reluctant acceptance of them derives from his recognition of the advantageousness of the social order, and conviction that constraint is indispensable to its functioning. We grant that it has been so but believe that this revolution, if it is fully consummated, will virtually remove the element of interest-conflict from man's environment. In freer interaction, the humanist ideal can be realized. We find it no less reasonable to postulate a functioning society without authority than to postulate an orderly universe without a god. Therefore the word "anarchy" is not for us freighted with connotations of disorder, chaos, or confusion. For humane men, living in noncompetitive conditions of freedom from toil and of universal affluence, anarchy is simply the appropriate state of society.

To recapitulate: with productivity already straining the economic system's capacity to cope with it, the impending advent of cheap nuclear power threatens an explosive expansion. These are prime preconditions for social disruption, but they do not ensure the terms on which society may be re-stabilized. Contending human forces will strive, according to their own diverse interests, to halt social and economic change or to control it to their advantage. Only those who have no stake in present institutions will wish it to run its course.

It follows that the working class, mortally concerned as it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to preserve the value of labor power, is not the class to bring about this revolution.

Those conscientious scholars, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, opened their 1848 exposition of the aims of the several social classes with the word "today," and *The Communist Manifesto* is a document that does not waste words. Now and here a new alignment of forces exists, radically different from that which they so accurately and concisely defined for their day.

We see today a capitalist class divided by the adherence of one segment to the principle of *laissez-faire* and the adoption by the other of the values of social planning. One wing would consign us to a jungle; the other, to an anthill. Both have access to far more potent media for influencing the opinions and attitudes of the people than were conceivable in Marx's time, and their ideologies permeate, in one or another degree, all other classes of society.

The reduction of the small manufacturers, shopkeepers, and independent artisans and farmers has proceeded to just about that point reckoned most desirable for preserving the still-cherished illusion of free opportunity. Their relative significance has diminished, but their role has not changed.

With the rise of institutional capitalism, a formerly negligible element has come to prominence—people having little or no share in ownership, but bound wholly to the class that buys their services and their loyalty. They constitute the career management of institutional capitalism and its professional retainers. Not oriented toward independent business or professional status, they have none of the outlook of the petty bourgeoisie. Their precariously privileged position in society is predicated upon their selling not their labor power only, but their whole selves; their role is to administer the means of production in the best interests of its owners. To do so, they identify their own welfare with that of the institution they serve so completely that their upper echelon is frequently confused with the bourgeoisie itself. Their philosophy is most succinctly embodied in Charles Wilson's conviction that what is good for General Motors is good for the country.

The working class itself has attained a degree of social privilege Marx did not believe possible under capitalism, though Engels, who outlived him, observed in England the beginnings of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its perversion. Even more critically, it is now a rapidly declining class. Its most skilled and adaptable members are recruited into the lower ranks of the lackeys above; mechanization and automation ruthlessly slough off its lower levels to the lumpenproletariat. That which remains is in the process of being divided into two distinct layers, according to the social value of their labor power—the favored workers in automated and semi-automated industries, and those in unautomated industry and services. No longer subjected to homogeneous conditions of life, they no longer have the basis for a common philosophy; working-class solidarity has become a nostalgic legend. Each of its organizations not corrupted outright by the capitalist class serves mainly the narrow interests of the particular trade or craft that it represents, sometimes at the expense of other organized workers, often at the expense of the unorganized, and almost always at the expense of working women and Negroes. To be sure, the working class stands opposed to the bourgeoisie, which exploits it. But its very existence as a class depends upon the continuance of the value of human labor power, and its institutions will work to preserve that. Its aim will be to contain the revolution.

This is not to say that workers may not align themselves with the truly revolutionary class. The essence of their exploitation is that they are constrained to labor, and consummation of the revolution will release them from that constraint. Their stake in the present social order is therefore less than the promise the revolution holds out to them. They too may be brought to defend their future rather than their present interests.

The lumpenproletariat, the declassed scum of society, Marx characterized as a rotting mass, now and then to be swept into a revolutionary movement but on the whole better fitted to be informers, scabs, and goons in the service of the bourgeoisie. He was undoubtedly quite correct. He recognized their affinity to the proletariat in that they had no share in the ownership of the means of production, but the lumpens comprise the slough of all classes, and in Marx's day the classes discarding slough were the decaying aristocracy, the peasantry, and the distressed petty bourgeoisie. The proletariat itself had little to discard: the industrial complex of a younger capitalism consumed it utterly. Marx detested these corrupt and fickle lumpens, and Marxists

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have scorned them ever since, without giving them a second look.

It is time to re-appraise them. The aristocracy is gone, and the rate of liquidation of the petty bourgeoisie is practically stabilized; now the overwhelming mass of lumpens comes from the working class. They are the hard-core unemployed and the young people who will never find jobs; they are the ex-miners of Appalachia and the ex-autoworkers of Detroit. A great many of them are Negro, many are Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, and Indian. It is absurd to call these people workers. They do not work; they do not expect to work again; as they adapt to their new conditions of life, they do not want to work. Living on relief or (statistically) on air, they are the most depressed element of modern society, proletarians in the Roman sense: people of no value to the social order. They are no longer even needed as strikebreakers; machines do it better. A government economist has dubbed them "no-people."

Yet they constitute today a true class, with a common relationship to the rest of society, with common attitudes and values unlike those of other classes, and with a common aspiration: to consume the fruits of humanity's conquest of nature without submitting to repressive social relations. The permissive lumpen-culture scorns all precepts to thrift, industriousness, and self-denial—that is, to the factitious morality that upholds wage-enslavement and privation. Their slogan is "Now!"—freedom now, peace now, abundance now. The homogeneity of their experience produces concerted actions without need for elaborate theory or formal organization. They, and they alone, can settle for nothing less than the transformation of society and the transformation of man. Their ranks are growing, and their vanguard is on the move.

Our re-examination now leads us to question whether the Left's usual methods of procedure are applicable to this new revolutionary situation. Reluctantly, for it is always comforting to walk in accustomed paths, we must conclude that they are not. The objective is no longer to replace one power structure with another, however benevolent; so our efforts must not serve to create institutions capable of assuming control. The old concepts of organization therefore can lead only to counter-revolution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, that the already emergent transformation of man is so essential to the new society demands tactics that will further its development. This, neither political maneuvering nor traditional forms of insurrection can do—on the contrary, they can only hinder it, and thus in effect prove counter-revolutionary also.

In the activities of the lumpens themselves we see an approach more congruous with the aims of this revolution. Resisting the war in Korea, they eschewed all organized forms of protest and simply dodged the draft, gold-bricked, and deserted—without apparent organization but none the less in mass. General Hershey testified bitterly to the volume and effect of their non-participation. Resisting wage-slavery, they simply adjust to living on welfare; and resisting welfare restrictions, they simply evade them. Though spontaneous, these are not merely scattered individualistic acts of personal expediency, but coherent and predictable responses of the class. As such, they reflect a solidarity of outlook that grows naturally out of common frustrations and common needs. Mass action thus motivated is the means that can destroy institutions of power without replacing them, and the practice-ground where men can function together on the basis of mutual understanding, without constraint either of binding ideology or of physical force. The normal modus operandi of the lumpenproletariat is also the logical tactic of the anarchist revolution.

What remains is that this hitherto mainly defensive action be turned to positive ends; this we now see happening in sections of the Negro movement. But with all enthusiasm for the Negro's effort, we insist that it is folly for white radicals to tail his kite. To pin our hopes on moving the mass of whites through a struggle but peripheral to their needs is to abandon the bulk of the oppressed to the demagogy of the far Right (which knows well how to use them) and to abandon the Negroes themselves to the white backlash. Until it is achieved, equality must of course be the Negro's overriding demand. But the fact is that many of the Negro's white friends have unwittingly and with the most commendable intentions become millstones around his neck, retarding the development of his own tactics of struggle. Those able to identify with his tactics as well as his aspirations have a particular contribution to make in bringing them into the broader arena.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Beyond equality, the Negro's needs are the same as those of his fellow-humans, and are not to be satisfied by a job soon lost to automation, a vote nullified by class bias of the electoral system, unsegregated indoctrination, and the replacement of moldering ghettos with jerry-built slums. The hearteningly dynamic drive for racial equality needs to be echoed by parallel (and equally direct) action for peace, personal liberty, and an equitable share of the goods and services our productive complex pours forth in such abundance, just beyond our reach.

It has been the habit of the Left to deplore insurgent action when it manifests itself in ways outside our approved (and by now institutionalized) forms. But the lumpen's approach is varied and flexible. He refuses by whatever device may be most expeditious to participate in the conduct of war; he does not cooperate with police and opposes enforcement of laws repressive of personal freedom in whatever manner may be feasible in any specific situation; he implements rupture of the job-income link by utilizing social welfare agencies, consumer credit, and whatever means may be at hand to preserve his consumption power. To proponents of the status quo, such procedures either are criminal or ought to be; to the several orthodoxies of the Left, they are (horror of horrors!) anarchistic. So be it. To a rapidly growing class they are the usual and accepted ways of coping with the environment—a fact to which only sectarianism or our own relative well-being could blind us. Police may bluster and social workers may moan, but the lumpens' rebellion continues to mount. Despite its sometimes nihilistic aspect, we acknowledge its revolutionary potential. As the practicability of an anarchic society on a cybernated economic base is popularized, it will find its direction and its purpose.

Then will the three streams of revolution be joined and an irresistible flood sweep away the damming power structures of old society, to carry man into that future of unlimited freedom in which his infinite aspirations may be realized.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

CHRISTMAS PRICES SLASH

All Cloth Bound Books Unless Otherwise Noted

12. PRIDE OF STATE by J. P. Morray. The relationship of patriotism to capitalism, socialism, communism, and civil liberties.
LIST $4.00 ..... ONLY $1.00

13. BURNING CONSCIENCE by Claude Eatherly and Gunther Anders, Preface by Berirand Russell. The book attacked by Huie in his HIROSHIMA PILOT.
LIST $4.00 ..... BARGAIN $1.00

14. THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran. A MUST book for every serious socialist.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

15. THE MANIFESTO. Contains a reproduction, from hand-set type, of THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO; also PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNISM by Engels, and THE MANIFESTO AFTER 100 YEARS by Huberman and Sweezy.
LIST $2.50 ..... SPECIAL $1.50

16. REVOLUTION IN SEATTLE by Harvey O'Connor. A stirring account of great deeds by great men narrated by a participant.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

17. MARXISM OF OUR TIME by Gilles Martinet. The editor of FRANCE-OBSERVATEUR takes a critical look at the theories of Marxism with a view to determining their validity in the world today.
LIST $3.25 ..... ONLY $2.00

18. WE, THE PEOPLE by Leo Huberman. A famous history of the U.S. with 58 illustrations by Thomas Hart Benton.
LIST $5.00 ..... SPECIAL $3.00

19. THE ORDEAL OF BRITISH GUIANA by Philip Reno. Background picture.
LIST $3.25 ..... ONLY $2.00

20. THREE TACTICS: THE BACKGROUND IN MARX by Stanley Moore. Traces back to Marx some of the issues currently dividing the USSR and China.
LIST $2.25 ..... SPECIAL $1.25

22. THE SOCIALIST REGISTER, 1964, edited by Miliband and Saville. The first of a series of books covering the international scene. Deutscher's article on "Maoism" is alone worth the cost.
LIST $6.00 ..... SPECIAL $4.00

23. PAPERBACK SPECIAL
FOURTEEN MR paperbacks in history, economics, sociology, and current affairs which make an ideal gift package.
LIST $26.85 ..... SPECIAL $20.00

24. THE UNITED STATES, CUBA, AND CASTRO by William Appleman Williams. A must for anyone interested in Cuba.
LIST $3.25 ..... SPECIAL $2.00

25. WORLD CRISIS IN OIL by Harvey O'Connor. A survey of the world industry.
LIST $7.50 ..... HALF PRICE $3.75

26. WELLINGTON ROAD by Margaret Lasell. Journal of six months with an English working class family on relief.
LIST $3.75 ..... SPECIAL $1.00

27. TIDE WITHOUT TURNING by John Gill. Dramatic story of Elijah Lovejoy.
LIST $4.50 ..... BARGAIN $1.00

28. FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray. The arguments of both sides explained and evaluated. Contains the complete texts of the most crucial documents.
LIST $8.50 ..... SPECIAL $5.00

29. CHINA TRIUMPHS by Julio Alvarez del Vayo. See box below.
LIST $5.00 ..... PREPUBLICATION $3.00

30. THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL by Rosa Luxemburg. Reprint of a classic.
LIST $7.50 ..... SPECIAL $5.00

31. THE SECOND REVOLUTION IN CUBA by J. P. Morray. Shows how the development of the Cuban Revolution after January, 1959 changed the ideology and character of the regime to one of socialism and Marxist Leninism.
LIST $3.25 ..... SPECIAL $2.00

21. CHINA SPECIAL

Three books that should be in every socialist library:

1. CHINA TRIUMPHS by Julio Alvarez del Vayo. Eye-witness account by the former Foreign Minister of the Republican government of Spain. List price $5.00. Ready in December.

2. NOTES FROM CHINA by Joan Robinson. Two essays on "The Chinese Point of View" and "The People's Communes" by the famous English economist who visited China three times. Paperback, list price 75¢.

3. THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley. The history of the Chinese Revolution graphically narrated via the biography of Chu Teh. List price $6.75.

LIST $12.50 ..... SPECIAL COMBINATION PRICE FOR ALL 3 BOOKS $7.00

All orders must be postmarked not later than D

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OOK SALE
) UP TO 75%

Ideal Christmas Gifts

CAPITALISM AS A SYSTEM by Oliver Cox. The evolution of capitalism from its iest beginnings.
T $6.50 ..... PREPUBLICATION $4.00

MARXISM AND MORAL CONCEPTS by iliam Ash. Marxist ideas in ethics and ality.
T $3.50 ..... PREPUBLICATION $2.50

4. THE MAN AT THE DOOR WITH HE GUN by Cedric Belfrage. "This is great book"—Han Suyin.
IST $4.50 ..... HALF PRICE $2.25

PUERTO RICO by Gordon K. Lewis. The initive work on the subject.
T $10.00 ..... SPECIAL $6.00

IN PLACE OF FEAR by Aneurin Bevan. ucidation by an authentic voice of British ialism"LIBRARY JOURNAL.
T $4.50 ..... SPECIAL $2.50

SOVIET EDUCATION TODAY by Deana vin. "It tells much more about Russia, its rdships and achievements, than any book I ve read for a long time."—Jennie Lee
T $4.00 ..... SPECIAL $2.25

38. THE MENACE OF THE MIRACLE: GERMANY FROM HITLER TO ADENAUER by Heinz Abosch. Relates the development of German society to the economic, social, and moral problems of our time.
LIST $5.00 ..... HALF PRICE $2.50

39. WILLIAM MORRIS: THE MAN AND THE MYTH by R. Page Arnot. A defense of Morris as a revolutionary socialist against the "canonization" of him by the Establishment as a wooly-minded reformer.
LIST $3.25 ..... PREPUBLICATION $2.50

40. THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy. Should be in every socialist library.
LIST $6.00 ..... SPECIAL $4.50

41. PARLIAMENTARY SOCIALISM by Miliband. This essay in political sociology on the nature of politics in British society puts special emphasis on the role of the Labour Party. With England under a new Labour government, this book is a must for the serious student.
LIST $6.00 ..... PREPUBLICATION $4.00

2. REPORT TO THE STOCKHOLDERS AND OTHER POEMS by John Beecher. This is a ollector's item. The MR Press edition, photo offset from the original which sold in umbered and signed copies for $10, is a beautiful Xmas gift.
IST PRICE $3.00 ..... HALF PRICE $1.50

ggested order form below. Please be sure to enclose correct payment with name d address printed plainly.

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10014

Enclosed find $..... Please rush to me, postage paid, the selections circled below.

12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	
33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	

Name .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

Address .....

31. Titles go up to list price again on January 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AGRARIAN "REFORM" IN SOUTH VIETNAM

BY RICHARD MORROCK

The bulk of American aid to the underdeveloped countries is in the form of military assistance. The largest per capita recipients are almost invariably dictatorships which rely upon this military assistance to maintain "law and order" against "Communist subversion." South Korea, Laos, Iran, Spain, and now Brazil are illustrative examples. The economic assistance which accompanies the military aid, in comparatively miserly amounts, is in effect balm for the troubled soul of the American taxpayer. If the United States is shoring up dictatorships in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and elsewhere, at least American public opinion can rest assured that these are streamlined, progressive dictatorships, which better the lot of the common peasant through altruistic reforms.

One of the foremost "beneficiaries" of American foreign aid has been South Vietnam. Wrote Robert Trumbull in the *New York Times* of May 12, 1961: "United States authorities estimate that American military aid already covers 80 percent of South Vietnam's defense budget. In addition, economic assistance has totalled more than $1,300,000,000 since 1955." That was written at the start of American military involvement in the South Vietnamese civil war, and since that time American aid has poured into South Vietnam at a rate of more than $1,500,000 per day.

Much of the economic aid given to South Vietnam was expended upon an agrarian reform plan. The implementation of this plan goes a long way toward explaining the resumption of hostilities in South Vietnam after 1955.

It should be noted at this point that in northern and central Vietnam, large estates were rare, even before the rise of the Viet

The author is a doctoral candidate in International Relations at Columbia University.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Minh. In those areas, the largest landholdings were the French-owned rubber plantations. Vietnamese who possessed enough land to warrant the hiring of labor generally worked on their holdings themselves; in that respect, they resembled the kulaks of pre-revolutionary Russia, and the "rich peasants" of China, rather than feudal landlords.

In the Mekong delta, to the south, conditions differed. The lower population density allowed for the existence of estates of greater size. Until late in the French-Indochina War, the problem of inequitable land distribution was as pressing in the southern third of Vietnam as in contemporary Latin America.

During the war between France and the Viet Minh, many landlords in the Mekong delta fled the troubled countryside for the safety of the French-held towns. Wherever possible, the Viet Minh broke up the large estates, distributed land to the peasants without compensation for the former owners, and cancelled debts and rents. By 1954, the French were secure only in the larger towns, and the expropriation of the latifundia was all but universal in the delta. Thus, when Ngo Dinh Diem came to power in mid-1954, the problem of land distribution in South Vietnam, at least as far as the peasants were concerned, had been solved. Through its radical agrarian policies, the Viet Minh had won the support of the majority of the peasantry which is the most numerous class in Vietnam.

Once the war had ended, a relative calm descended upon the countryside. In the North, the Viet Minh ruled; in the South, Ngo Dinh Diem held power, backed by the United States. The southern landlords began seeking ways to recover their lost property. Some even wanted the back rents for the years they had spent hiding in Saigon. As a class, the dispossessed landlords were the logical allies of Diem, whose aim was to turn the clock back in South Vietnam and erase all effects of the anti-colonialist resistance.

Diem drew upon the services of the American expert, Wolf Ladejinsky. The latter produced a land reform ordinance which united the landlords, not the peasants, behind the Diem regime. The Diem-Ladejinsky ordinance "was in fact proclaimed at a time when large landowners seemed to be regaining influence in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

places of political power, and was in many respects an inadequate compromise measure." (David Wurfel, "Agrarian Reform in the Republic of Vietnam," *Far Eastern Survey,* June 1957, p. 81.) It was to be expected, of course, that the failure of the Viet Minh to gain control of South Vietnam would mean that its policies—for better or worse—would not be implemented south of the Ben Hai river. What was most ironic is that Ladejinsky, the man in charge of giving South Vietnam back to the landlords, had himself once been labelled a Communist by Senator Joseph McCarthy.

The program seemed progressive enough on the surface, if one did not know the realities of property relations in the South Vietnamese countryside after 1954. It called for the reduction of rents from the prewar 40-50 percent to 15-25 percent of the principal crop, depending upon the value of the land for the exact percentage. Interest charges on loans, and rent on tools and draft animals, were not to exceed 12 percent. (Price Gittinger in Richard Lindholm, ed., *Vietnam: The First Five Years,* p. 201.) As for land ownership, the landlords were "limited" to 245 acres (although more land could be allotted them for "religious purposes"), and the land that was confiscated was paid for. According to Tillman Durdin, 10 percent of its value was paid immediately in cash, and the remainder in government bonds. (*New York Times,* April 2, 1959.) Regulations regarding abandoned land were favorable to the owners; landlords had only to "declare their intention either to lease abandoned land or to cultivate it themselves; otherwise they were to be considered absent." (Gittinger, *op. cit.,* p. 201.) The unclaimed land was often reserved for occupation by Roman Catholic refugees from North Vietnam.

The reforms were intended more for impressing foreign, especially American, public opinion with the "democratic national revolution" that was supposedly taking place in South Vietnam, than for improving the conditions of the peasantry. The provisions which restricted the landlords were, in fact, not always enforced. Furthermore, and most important, Diem's "reforms" constituted actual retrogression. The government was "reducing" rents which the Viet Minh had abolished, selling land which the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Viet Minh had given away, and re-establishing estates which the Viet Minh had broken up.

Peasant resistance to these measures was widespread, foreshadowing the civil war which was to come. Already in the spring of 1955, Ladejinsky reported finding what the *New York Times* described as "a strange land reform problem." The *Times* elaborated: "Usually it is the tenants who are most eager for land reform and the landlords who are reluctant. In the southern half of Vietnam, however, the landlords are accepting the Government's land reform plan more readily than the tenants." (April 5, 1955.)

The government's ordinance provided for Agrarian Reform Committees, consisting of district or provincial chiefs, plus equal numbers of representatives of tenants and landlords. The tenants, however, obstructed the elections of their own representatives. They refused "to have anything to do with the machinery of the new rent control law. In some areas many potential electors stayed away during balloting for tenant representatives, and there were even instances of tenants going to polling places in groups, then ostentatiously refusing to vote." (Wurfel, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-85.) It often became necessary for the provincial chiefs to appoint the tenant "representatives."

The peasants, led by former Viet Minh cadres, began to organize violent resistance to Diem's effort to undo the Viet Minh's land reform. "Indeed," wrote Wesley Fishel in 1959, "the main target of the Communist effort in recent months has been the government's land reform program. . . . Terrorist attacks on agents sent out from Saigon to explain the land reform idea or to carry out land surveys or division have caused delays. Nevertheless, some 750,000 of a total of about one million acres of eligible rice land in South Vietnam have been redistributed." ("Vietnam's War of Attrition," *The New Leader,* December 7, 1959, p. 18.) Fishel does not specify in what manner the land was redistributed.

Wolf Ladejinsky and Ngo Dinh Diem viewed the growing resistance in the countryside not as a danger signal, but as a sign of success. "The Viet Minh's opposition to South Vietnam's reforms," wrote Ladejinsky in 1961, "is violent precisely because they are successful." (Wesley Fishel, ed., *Problems of Freedom*:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South Vietnam Since Independence, p. 175.) If violent resistance is the mark of a successful agrarian policy, one can only speculate as to what might cause Ladejinsky to consider the program a failure.

Imperialism is a depraved choice of national life, imposed by self-seeking interests which appeal to the lusts of quantitative acquisitiveness and of forceful domination surviving in a nation from early centuries of animal struggle for existence. Its adoption as a policy implies a deliberate renunciation of that cultivation of the higher inner qualities which for a nation as for an individual constitutes the ascendancy of reason over brute impulse. It is the besetting sin of all successful states, and its penalty is unalterable in the order of nature.

—*J. A. Hobson,* Imperialism

It is true, as I have already stated, that I have been influenced by Marxist thought. But this is also true of many of the leaders of the new independent States. Such widely different persons as Gandhi, Nehru, Nkrumah and Nasser all acknowledge this fact. We all accept the need for some form of socialism to enable our people to catch up with the advanced countries of this world and to overcome their legacy of extreme poverty.

—*Nelson Mandela*

The revolutionary movement in the advanced countries would in practice be a sheer fraud if, in their struggle against capital, the workers of Europe and America were not closely and completely united with the hundreds upon hundreds of millions of colonial slaves who are oppressed by capital.

—*Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 660*

Nelson Rockefeller, accused by some New Hampshire heckler of being a Robin Hood, blazed back indignantly: "I don't take from the rich!"

I wonder what's so good about that. Assuming that government, to keep the paint from peeling, and to feed its armies, must take from someone, why not from the rich? Should it rather be from the poor?

Well, of course that's where it really is from, because the rich pay hardly any taxes at all, in proportion. But observe how thoroughly brainwashed we all have been, when we automatically assume that soaking the rich is a sin, and when we hardly quaver as politicians devise complicated schemes to soak the poor.

—*Robert Smith,* The York Gazette and Daily

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COLONIAL WAR AT HOME: A COMMENT

BY H. W. EDWARDS

The May MONTHLY REVIEW had an interesting editorial, "The Colonial War at Home." Its conclusion was that "it is already much too late to avoid something very like a colonial war in America." I would like to comment on the relationship between this prognostication and the goals we are seeking to attain.

Under what condition is "apocalypse," as pictured by Rob Williams, inevitable? It seems to me that the answer is inextricable from the goal to which such violence would be directed.

The editors of MR dealt at some length with the goal of the "old" leadership of the United States Black Revolt: its ties to the status quo, its demand to obtain "a fair share" of the existing "pie." Strangely enough, however, they asked no questions about the goal of either RAM's Max Stanford or Williams, apparently assuming that their militant talk is about revolution. Yet, in the lengthy quotation from Williams, a goal is clearly stated; while, in the even longer excerpt from Stanford, he does not do so.

Williams' goal is "the implementation of the U.S. Constitution with justice and equality for all people." In plain words, after the "self-defensive apocalypse" pictured, he would "do better" with the status quo, à la British Labor.

As for Stanford, while he outlines revolutionary methods and does not propose carving alleged gains out of what exists, his movement still appears to me to aim at black people administering, presumably minus present injustices, "black affairs" without specifying what kind.

Has not history sufficiently proven by now that attempts at either a "just" black administration in the United States as presently constituted or any portion thereof, or at "implementing" the American Constitution, invariably run smack into the im-

---

Mrs. Edwards is a white American married to a black American and now living with her husband in Ghana.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movable obstacle which is the present system? Is not the Constitution par excellence the document and servitor of the 18th-century bourgeois revolution and thus, as Lenin's *State and Revolution* teaches, totally unsuitable for making a new world? For, was not the bourgeois revolution of the West founded and maintained precisely on and by national and international color injustice; specifically, super-exploitation of dark-skinned people? MR, of course, delineates the American economy in just these terms, bringing the first semblance of realism to any appraisal of Afro-America by the United States Left.

But for the same reason, anyone who wishes to alter this "racial" economy simply to make it "more equitable" has to fight on existing battlegrounds. The determining circumstance in this regard, forcing the war into racial channels, is the income differential established by imperialism based on color. Imperialism stole from black people and shared the swag with "its" whites, thus "investing" money not its own in a racial set-up which became self-perpetuating because these differentials, of themselves, ensure that any alteration in the status quo short of overthrow must be fought for by blacks against defending whites. There is simply no way under the status quo to subtract racialism and fight along "pure" economic and/or political lines.

This brings me to my point: the objective situation both inside the United States and internationally is such that the one factor likely to ensure success for its Black Revolt is *statement of a revolutionary goal.*

Consider the following thoughts:

(1) Williams assumes that the world black revolution will automatically come to the aid of Afro-Americans once they start their bloody holocaust in the name of self-defense. Isn't this assuming that mutual possession of black skins on both sides of the ocean is all that is required? Yet, as long as the American Black Revolt fights to improve its own position within the status quo, it must move counter to the aims and conditions of its proposed African allies. For, by not challenging the status quo, it helps prolong the life of American imperialism, the worst enemy of the world's peoples today. Moreover, as the world's leading neo-colonialism, that same imperialism constantly worsens the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

existing material conditions of "the third world." Thus, only the adoption of a socialist goal, under whatever name, by the Black Revolt can actually bring it into political harmony with its "natural" allies (who, under the acknowledged leadership of Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah, have shown a statesmanlike aversion to "color thinking"). This alone, it seems to me, can evoke that outside all-out support indispensable to the Black Revolt's own success.

(2) The MR editorial notes "that during the last hundred years the great majority of white working people in the exploiting imperialist countries have been cut in on a share of the surpluses wrung from the labor of the exploited races and therefore have a stake in preserving the system of exploitation."

This is a greatly needed admission from "Western" Marxists. However, is it not required of Marxists that, to explain and/or alter any situation, they recognize all factors in it? In this light, MR tells only part of the story. For Afro-America actually lives a dual existence: while it is indeed the exploited "sub-proletariat" of the United States, on a world scale at the same time, a large portion of it definitely (thus far) benefits (even if to a lesser degree than whites) from international United States color exploitation. This becomes apparent immediately on comparing its income with that of its African allies. The 1959 Bureau of Census figures, using median wages, show that at least half the Afro-American community is 13 or more times better off than the highest paid African worker south of Sahara today.

Citing this condition is not intended to, nor can it, detract from brutal injustices perpetrated on Afro-America. Nonetheless, to my mind it plays its role, determining both the failure to adopt a revolutionary position till now, even though events are inexorably driving the movement itself in that direction, and the partiality for non-violence, which (for instance) helps limit property damage during demonstrations.

(3) Talking about what Negroes must do, Williams notes the indispensability of internal allies: "We do not need paternal white 'big daddies' for our friends now. What we need are some fighting John Browns."

John Brown was a white revolutionary who aimed to destroy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American slavocracy. In my opinion, such people will appear only in response to revolutionary goals ensuring victory for the whole American people. Their presence, evoked by such goals, would form a bridge to wider sections among Americans without whom—even taking account of their past sins and present incorrect thinking—no American revolution can succeed.

It is not that I think white allies are necessary because black people are incapable of defining their own aims or reaching them under their own steam. This mistake was made for too long by the "orthodox" American Left. But is it not a truism that any revolution must be maintained and finished by at least the decisive sectors of the population in any country? Revolutions can, of course, be started by minorities, as the Bolsheviks did in 1917 Russia. But they had mass support from the peasantry, a point considered crucial to their success. Thus, while one tenth of a nation's people could undoubtedly start a revolution, no matter how just its cause it could not complete that job unless it had decisive (not necessarily majority) support internally. Such support in the United States can come only from whites. But with all the good will in the universe, the rest of the world cannot make the American revolution because revolution can not be exported.

So, Williams' chaos, designed to initiate a change, could only bring about a terrible defeat for the Black Revolt; not because of the blood, but because that blood would be serving a historically impossible goal (even assuming he could first achieve the absolutely indispensable total unity of America's 22 million Negroes, which at present is far from a reality). Throughout the world, in history, real revolutions have revealed that bloody holocausts invariably come not from revolutionaries but from counter-revolution.

It further seems to me that the "apocalyptic vision" which Williams offers, presumably as his idea of "revolution," is really more like the imperialist-spawned lie of what "revolution is like," designed to frighten off as many participants as possible. Thus, when Williams says, "If we are going to talk about revolution, let us know what revolution means," he may be saying more than he intended. As I understand it, revolution is part of a science. Planned, it serves a definite, compatible goal. In a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

word, it is actually the only guarantee of *avoiding* the thing Williams pictures.

What is more, in discussing the decisive combined effort of the Black Revolt and its "fighting John Brown" allies, it should be understood that whites need this alliance as much as black people do. At present, white super-wages are tacitly assumed to be in the interest of white people. However, they actually thwart real "white interests." This is because they prevent white people from understanding that the incredibly immense private profits, at present siphoned off into private pockets while the "color battle" goes on, would become available to society without discrimination under a different economic system.

Furthermore, the white super-wage "stake in the status quo" daily becomes more transient: the advancing international anti-colonialist revolution—which *can* succeed and *is* succeeding without significant support from white Western workers—is whittling away at the source of United States super-profits and super-wages. When Belgium seemed about to lose her only major colony, the Congo, her rulers instituted an austerity program, turning inward to recoup expected colonial losses. Thus, as anti-colonialist victories grow, a situation is evolving whereby the white working class must finally face "its own" ruling class, but totally unprepared for the confrontation. The result could only be terrible casualties.

In addition, while the automation revolution in American industry is first sweeping away the economic gains of Negroes made during two world wars, it cannot avoid affecting (as it has already begun to do) the conditions of white people. Now, such dispossessed whites are either potential allies of the Black Revolt or (and that is how matters stand at the moment, as MR noted) potential storm troops against it.

However, neither automation's inroads against whites nor the victory of anti-colonialism have yet advanced to their limits. Nor has the world obligingly stood still at a point favorable to the achievement of a "black bourgeois revolution." Neither imprecations nor blood-letting can gain for a bourgeois-oriented Black Revolt anything but a new version of Iraq or Brazil. That is why the Black Revolt is moving inexorably toward a revolutionary position.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The material in MR's editorial proved that the Black Revolt's vanguard is right on the verge of exactly this. Since it was written, Malcolm X has visited Ghana, where he made some speeches, and also talked privately with a large number of Africans (including President Nkrumah) and Afro-Americans—all socialist-oriented. When he spoke at the University of Ghana, he did so under the auspices of its Marxist Society. Back in the United States at Chicago, if reports seeping through here are reliable, he openly repudiated "white vs. black" tactics. All this may very well add up to a possible bid by Malcolm X to lead the Black Revolt to an open statement of a scientific revolutionary goal. If so, American white people may get a reprieve which they have definitely not earned in the form of a real American revolution which can draw on the best among whites *under black leadership.*

These combined facts, it seems to me, indicate that it is definitely not "much too late to avoid something very like a colonial war in America." There is much in the whole picture that is hopeful, and I think this should be recognized.

I have met only a very few people—and most of these were not Americans—who had any real desire to be free. Freedom is hard to bear. It can be objected that I am speaking of political freedom in spiritual terms, but the political institutions of any nation are always menaced and are ultimately controlled by the spiritual state of that nation. We are controlled here by our confusion, far more than we know, and the American dream has, therefore, become something much more closely resembling a nightmare, on the private, domestic, and international levels. Privately, we cannot stand our lives and dare not examine them; domestically, we take no responsibility for (and no pride in) what goes on in our country; and, internationally, for many millions of people, we are an umitigated disaster.

—*James Baldwin, The Fire Next Time*

I am tempted to believe that what we call necessary institutions are often no more than institutions to which we have become accustomed . . . that in matters of social constitution the field of possibilities is much more extensive than men living in their various societies are ready to imagine.

—*Alexis de Tocqueville*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TODAY'S MESSIAH

BY LEOPOLDO ARAGON

The United States appears to be of the opinion that it is God's consultant on terrestrial matters, and that God, after lending an attentive and respectful ear, has named it His trouble-shooter on this planet. This Messianic concept of national destiny has not recently prevailed in the world; I think sixteenth century Spain was the last nation to entertain such fancies. The English never rose to such arrogance; Kipling, the bard of Imperialism, modestly limited himself to writing of "the white man's burden." The German Nazis spoke of themselves as *Herrenfolk,* the Master Race; but they did not claim a divine mandate.

U.S. foreign policy today can only be compared to the fanaticism of the Counter Reformation. It wishes to save the world from "error" by imposing its "truth." And it refuses to accept even the concept of *cuius regio, eius religio,* "whose the region, his the religion."

The conclusions presented here are the outgrowth of the writer's intimate contact with the very nerve center of U.S. politics, over a period of years, first as a student and later as a journalist.

The U.S. does not currently seek territorial expansion, since it has already experienced such a cycle, the completion of which brought satiety: Florida, Louisiana, half of Mexico, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Panama, the Virgin Islands, the Caroline Islands, Liberia (in reality a colony of Firestone, just as Honduras is a United Fruit Company colony), and, most recently, the Japanese island of Okinawa. Current U.S. foreign policy does not any longer reflect the concepts of classical imperialism.

The U.S. considers that it has a mission to save the world from error, first by blocking the spread of the major error—

Translated by Bobbye Ortiz, from the Mexican newspaper *El Dia,* August 23, 1964.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

communism—and by rescuing from error those already committed to it. (We have only to recall declarations made by Truman, McCarthy, Eisenhower, Dulles, Kennedy, Goldwater, Johnson, Rusk, and many other U.S. personalities, all of whom have repeated this theme in infinite variation.)

This national sentiment, product of unremitting self-adoration (just listen to the average American on the subject of the U.S. . . . and the rest of the world), is Messianic, not only in wanting to extirpate error but also in its obsession with molding the rest of the world in its image; and, in the course of this process, self-righteousness knows no bounds.

The U.S. claims the right to intervene wherever it chooses because it is convinced that what it seeks to achieve is good, rather like a father who forces a purgative on his child "because it will cure his sickness." The U.S. sees itself as the father of the entire world.

Without prior knowledge of the U.S. mentality it is impossible to understand its international conduct, which is based on the assumption that the end justifies the means. The most recent manifestation of this anomalous morality occurred in the Congo, a region that does not ordinarily capture the attention of Latin Americans. It happens, however, that the events now taking place there, if they were not occurring under the public gaze, would provide material for a book of political pornography. Formerly, such shameful acts of U.S. armed intervention were carried out in secret. Now, the U.S. doesn't even trouble itself to offer a justification, and its intervention is undisguised. U.S. military equipment of every variety, as well as U.S. personnel, are used to kill Congolese, to kill people who cannot even be labelled communists, because their primitive state of political development does not reach such a level of "sophistication"—a fact admitted off the record by State Department officers in "background" press conferences.

What is the "error" of the restless Congolese tribes? Simply that they hinder the extraction and transport of minerals in Katanga—and the mines are owned by a Belgian-English-Rockefeller partnership. Tshombe has been designated as custodian of the region and, therefore, Tshombe's "government" will receive whatever aid is necessary for the normalization of mine opera-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, according to the agreement reached in Brussels in August 1964 between Under Secretary of State Harriman and the "socialist" Paul-Henri Spaak, the Belgian Minister of Foreign Relations.

Like Tshombe's "free world," the "free world" of South Vietnam, Turkey, Formosa, and Latin America lives under the "protective" custody of the U.S.

After the bombing of North Vietnam by the U.S. and the Turkish terrorist massacres in Cyprus, carried out by American planes and bombs (the U.S. did not even "lament," as is its hypocritical custom, the loss of Cypriot lives), the events in the Congo come as sharp warnings to those who have fallen into "error" and to those who might fall into "error"; they will be purified by blood and fire, according to the divine mandate.

President Johnson has gone even further in his imprecations than John Foster Dulles, the late High Priest of Imperialism, who thundered threats on the official level while his brother Allen, director of the CIA, carried out the dirty work. Now everything is done openly, with the effrontery of those who consider themselves safe from punishment because there is no direct confrontation with the other world power . . . for the moment.

In Revolutionary Cuba, more than any other place I have ever been, the people and the government have succeeded in making common cause. The people enjoy a life of freedom, daily satisfaction, social solidarity, and practical brotherhood such as most adults in the United States have long since decided is impossible of attainment. Perhaps we should ask the Cubans if they will send us a Peace Corps to instruct us in the way of practical idealism, before all the humanity is squeezed out of us. We could call off the blockade and send them some of our surplus food and machinery, in exchange. We were revolutionists in 1776. Perhaps, with the aid of Cuba, we could become revolutionists again.

—Dave Dellinger, Liberation, August, 1964

Since . . . owing to Africa's colonial background, there is no class of indigenous African capitalists, it is impossible to build up a capitalist system in the same way as, for example, Japan has done. A capitalist system in Africa upon the United States model, if it could be constructed at all, which is doubtful, would be essentially a system of the domination of Africa by foreign capital.

—Dr. Nkrumah

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Self-Appointed Cop

The *New York Times Magazine* for Sunday, August 16, 1964, printed a two page spread of photographs of the United States Seventh Fleet. The fleet consists of 3 cruisers, 4 carriers, 8 submarines, 25 amphibious ships, 30 destroyers, and 44 support ships—114 vessels in all plus 650 planes, manned by about 40,000 men. This formidable armada is reckoned to be one of the most massive on the planet.

The Seventh Fleet patrols the seas from Japan to Indonesia; "acting as policeman of the Western Pacific," according to the *New York Times* caption.

The Pacific is a large ocean. Along its shores are many nations, including China, the Soviet Union, Indonesia, and Japan. Were these nations consulted when the Seventh Fleet was appointed "Policeman of the Pacific"?

How would the United States react if the Seventh Fleet were Chinese, patrolling the seas from Vancouver Island to the Panama Canal?

Suppose Soviet Russia, China, Japan, and Indonesia should each commission a fleet carrying the title: Policeman of the Pacific. Would not Washington be outraged?

If the Pacific needs policing, would it not be reasonable and sensible for the United Nations to commission a fleet of police launches to do the job? The cost of such an operation would be only a tiny fraction of the Seventh Fleet outlay and the danger of war in the Pacific would be minimized.

Standard Imperial Practice

Senator Stennis of Mississippi, speaking in the Senate, anxiously referred to a report that United States military advisers, arms, and paratroopers had been airlifted into the Congo. The Senator hoped that this country "will not be committed on a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

piecemeal basis to the extent that we are in other areas of the world. I strongly oppose letting the Congo become our African Vietnam."

Spokesmen for the Johnson administration replied soothingly and reassuringly to Senator Stennis: "The Congo is not South Vietnam in any sense. North Vietnam is backed up against Red China and its supply lines cannot be interdicted. The Congo is isolated. . . . The comparison with Vietnam is pretty far-fetched." (*New York Times,* August 15, 1964, p. 1.)

Senator Stennis may well be worried. While it is true that Vietnam and the Congo are differently situated, it is also true that both produce valuable raw materials. It is also true that both countries have strong anti-imperialist movements.

Vietnam and the Congo are not alone in these respects. Many countries in Asia and Africa are rich in natural resources and strongly anti-imperialist. Policies presently followed by Washington might lead to intervention in any one of these areas.

Actually, in Vietnam and the Congo, Washington is following standard imperialist practice:

1. Find a "disturbed" area in the middle of Asia, Africa, or Latin America where United States interests are threatened by an uprising of local patriots.
2. Label the revolt "communist."
3. Select a local leader, preferably Western-trained, who has a popular following and is ready to sell his country and people down the river.
4. Sound a diplomatic alarm and send in a military mission with arms and military manpower.
5. Create or publicize an "incident." Send in more military power to be used protectively. Perhaps fight a "defensive" war.

Washington has no copyright on this imperialist formula, which has been used by British and French empire builders in the Americas and Africa, and by the Japanese in Far Asia. For empires and imperialists it is standard practice.

A Latin American Economist Views Imperialism

"How do imperialist countries carry on foreign commerce? For them, trade with underdeveloped nations is a means of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

providing themselves with cheap agricultural products and raw materials and selling their manufactures at high prices. Dependent countries are converted into appendices of the imperialist countries, having the function of supplying food and raw materials to their metropolitan areas. Trade between highly developed capitalist countries and under-developed countries is not a relation of mutual benefit but a way of enriching the stronger party at the cost of the weaker party." (*Argentina Economica y Social,* Marcelo Isacovich, Buenos Aires: Editorial Quipo 1961, p. 195.)

"Free World" Leaders in Action

British Guiana is a good example of the "free world" way of dealing with a colony.

British imperialists, like their American fellows, profess faith in democratic principles and promise democratic governments to their restless dependencies. British Guiana, still a Crown Colony, was given a limited constitution a decade ago and directed to hold a free election. The People's Progressive Party, organized in 1950, had widespread support among the city trade unions and the agricultural workers. In 1953 it won a majority in the Legislative Assembly and established a P.P.P. ministry, headed by the P.P.P. leader, Cheddi Jagan.

P.P.P. spokesmen were anti-imperialists and socialists. They demanded economic and social reforms plus eventual independence. Guiana has a population of 600,000, descended mainly from African slaves and Indian indentured servants. It is dominated and exploited by foreign (chiefly British) capital. Its chief products are food and raw materials. The Guianese buy their industrial products abroad, mostly from Britain. Poverty, illiteracy, under-employment, and disease were rampant when the P.P.P. won its first election. The Crown Colony was an ideal seed ground for dissatisfaction and for socialism.

After some parleying, British authorities reacted to the 1953 election by sending in the Navy, suspending the Constitution and establishing martial law. Ex-Premier Jagan was arrested and imprisoned for attending an out-of-bounds meeting.

More negotiations were followed by a maneuver which split the P.P.P. along racial lines and presumably opened the way for its defeat.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another election was held in 1957. The P.P.P. again won and formed a Ministry, again with Dr. Jagan as Premier. Four years later a third election was held, with the same result. A fourth election is scheduled for October 1964, this time under new election laws decreed by the British and opposed by the P.P.P. and the Jagan Government.

Between 1961 and 1964 the P.P.P. opposition resorted to rioting, arson, and murder in their efforts to force out the Jagan Government. On one occasion a large section of Georgetown, the capital of Guiana, was looted and burned. A general strike, launched to upset the P.P.P. Government, was accompanied by widespread violence. Money to finance the general strike came from United States sources.

President Kennedy, smarting under the Bay of Pigs defeat and the unexpected survival and success of the Castro Government in Cuba, asked and received assurances from the British Prime Minister that Britain would not grant independence to Guiana so long as a government controlled by the P.P.P. survived.

Guiana has a government duly elected on three occasions in the past decade. The number one demand of this government, and of the governing party, is independence. This demand has been repeatedly refused by the British, who, with their Washington associates, have launched a reign of terror in order to destroy a colonial government which they have repeatedly failed to defeat in open free elections.

British Guiana provides a striking illustration of collusion between the two leading imperialist powers to prevent the emergence in the Americas of a second socialist country. America's first socialist government, in Cuba, won out in the course of a bitter civil war, waged by the Castro-led rebels against a Cuban government financed, armed, and bossed by Washington. Colonial leaders in Guiana have followed strictly democratic procedures, winning three elections in a row.

The P.P.P. objective? Speedy advance from colonial backwardness to socialist independence.

To get the evidence, chapter and verse, of high-handed, illegal intervention by the British and United States oligarchies in the internal affairs of the Guianese people read *The Ordeal of British Guiana* by Philip Reno (Monthly Review Press.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another Atrocity Story

The Women's International Democratic Federation (Unter den Linden 12, Berlin W. 8, Germany) has released a statement issued by the Union of Vietnamese Women: "We strenuously denounce to world public opinion a new evil crime of the American imperialists and their lackeys in South Vietnam. On July 8, 1964 at 3 p.m., their artillery fired 200 shells on a school in the municipality of Lingphung, Giongtron district, Bentre Province, during school hours when the school was full of students. Many of them were wounded and screaming with pain. The population ran to their help. Then the American planes dropped 50 napalm bombs, causing new victims and setting fire to numerous houses. A number of school children became living torches as they tried to run home. The casualties are 62 dead and wounded, 43 of them school children. The school and 37 dwellings were burned and 3 hectares of the school grounds destroyed."

Afro-Asian Appeal Against Imperialism

The sixth session of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Council, held in Algiers, March 22-27, 1964 was attended by 200 delegates from 54 Afro-Asian countries. The Council adopted the following resolution against imperialism: "The conscience of mankind cannot rest at ease as long as oppressed peoples remain on earth, as long as the colonialists run amuck in Angola, 'Portuguese' Guinea, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, South Africa, as long as the peoples of these and other territories and countries are subjected to disgrace of colonial slavery, to indignities and terror by the foreign enslavers and racialists. We resolutely declare that we will not relax our struggle as long as no end is put to the occupation of South Vietnam, South Korea, Taiwan, Okinawa, and other territories by the U.S. imperialists, as long as the last colonialist is not driven from the territory of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

Anti-imperialism is one of the most widely distributed facts of modern life. It animates and gives direction to the thinking and actions of hundreds of millions of our fellow humans. Anti-imperialism was written into the United States Declaration of Independence. It is to be found in the official documents and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

utterances of the two-score countries that have won or are winning their independence during the past twenty years. Anti-imperialism is a force of vast consequence in the direction of present-day world affairs. It is the negative side of a process which is tearing down an outmoded social order. The positive side of the process is socialist construction.

Double-Talk at the Summit

President Johnson spoke by telephone at the commissioning of the Polaris submarine *Casimir Pulaski* at Groton, Connecticut, on August 14, 1964. He said that no nation on earth can match the military might of the United States. But, he insisted, "that strength is committed to peace, and that commitment is both irrevocable and unhesitating." President Johnson continued: "In this century America has sent her sons to hazard all for freedom throughout the world. Many have not returned, but their sacrifice has not been in vain." As a result of these wars, "the world is safer and our freedom is more secure. The hope for peace is brighter and the confidence of ultimate victory for our cause has never been greater than it is now."

Following out this line of argument: if a Polaris submarine armed with nuclear weapons, rather than a white dove, is the real symbol of peace, a hundred ships, so armed, should make peace reasonably secure, and a thousand would make peace absolutely certain.

In the same vein, if the wars of 1914 and 1939 safeguarded peace and increased freedom, another couple of wars should add even more to human happiness and well-being.

Logically, the President should be for bigger guns and more wars, *or* for negotiation and disarmament. Even in an election year a politician should not try in the same speech to opt both for bigger guns and more peace.

It is as inaccurate to say that we "gave" Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union as to say that the Soviets "destroyed" democracy there. We could not give what we did not have, and the Soviets could not destroy what did not exist.

—*Fred Warner Neal, U.S. Foreign Policy and the Soviet Union*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Studies on the Left

A JOURNAL OF RESEARCH, SOCIAL THEORY, AND REVIEW

VOLUME IV, NUMBER 3

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE NORTHERN GHETTO
by the Editors

APARTHEID USA: URBAN RENEWAL
by Stanley B. Winters

THE CASE FOR A RADICAL POLITICS
by Sumner M. Rosen

DOCUMENTS:
BLACK NATIONALISM, THE EARLY DEBATE
by Marcus Garvey, W.E.B. DuBois, Chandler Owens

COMMUNICATIONS: NACH GOLDWASSER UNS?
by James Weinstein

REVIEWS: THE WHITE LIBERAL'S CRISIS, by Ronald Radosh —WHEN THE WORD IS GIVEN, by Ann J. Lane— WARREN MILLER'S HARLEM, by Marc Schleifer—THE CANDIDACY OF NORMAN MAILER, by Lawrence Goldman

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY: TOWARDS A THEORY OF COMMUNITY UNIONS, by James O'Connor—POVERTY, POLITICS AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION, by Stanley Aronowitz

IN THE NEXT ISSUE:

THE FUTURE OF THE LATIN AMERICAN LEFT
Brazilian Politics—Brazil After the Coup—Brazil's Student Movement—The Agricultural Question—Chile, The Dark Side of Stability—Venezuela and the Theory of Terror—The Foundations of Cuban Socialism—Latin American Diary—Reviews of the Fiction of Asturias and Fuentes

----------SUBSCRIBE NOW----------

Subscription, $3.50 for four issues ($4.00 foreign)

Name ..... Address .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

Mail to: STUDIES ON THE LEFT, P.O. BOX 33, PLANETARIUM STATION, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10024

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

a must for your socialist library . . .

THE SOCIALIST REGISTER: 1964

edited by RALPH MILIBAND and JOHN SAVILLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Contemporary Politics

Maoism—Its Origins, Background and Outlook — ISAAC DEUTSCHER
Nasserism and Socialism — A. ABDEL-MALEK
The Economics of Neo-Capitalism — ERNEST MANDEL
West Germany: The Reactionary Democracy — J. M. VINCENT
Aspects of Italian Communism — MICHEL BOSQUET
Socialism and the Myth of the Golden Past — RALPH MILIBAND
Imperialism Old and New — HAMZA ALAVI
The Alliance for Progress — DAVID HOROWITZ

II. Britain

Labour Policy and the Labour Left — RALPH MILIBAND and JOHN SAVILLE
Trade Unions in Contemporary Capitalism — V. L. ALLEN
The Structure of the Trade Union Movement — J. E. MORTIMER
The Politics of Encounter — JOHN SAVILLE

III. Review Articles

Theories of Thermonuclear Deterrence — WALTER GOLDSTEIN
Marxist Ethics and Ethical Theory — DONALD C. HODGES
Nationalization in Britain — M. BARRATT BROWN
Farewells to Empire — V. G. KIERNAN

IV. Socialist History

1914—The Great Schism — MARCEL LIEBMAN
The British Labour Movement and the International in 1864 — ROYDEN HARRISON

List price: $6.00 cloth; $3.45 paper
Price until Dec. 31: $4.00 cloth; $2.50 paper

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York, N. Y. 10014

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION (Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code).

1. Date of Filing: October 1, 1964
2. Title of Publication: Monthly Review
3. Frequency of Issue: Monthly except July and August when bi-monthly.
4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014
5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014
6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor:
   Publisher—Monthly Review, Inc., 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014
   Editor—Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014
   Managing Editor—Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014
7. Owner: Monthly Review, Inc., 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014; Stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock: Leo Huberman, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014; Paul M. Sweezy, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014; Sybil H. May, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, New York 10014.
8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: None.
9. Paragraphs 7 and 8 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. Names and addresses of individuals who are stockholders of a corporation which itself is a stockholder or holder of bonds, mortgages or other securities of the publishing corporation have been included in paragraphs 7 and 8 when the interests of such individuals are equivalent to 1 percent or more of the total amount of the stock or securities of the publishing corporation.
10. Circulation:

	Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months	Single Issue Nearest To Filing Date
A. Total No. copies printed (Net Press Run)	8,963	9,100
B. Paid Circulation		
1. To term subscribers by mail, carrier delivery or by other means.	6,103	5,859
2. Sales through agents, news dealers, or otherwise.	2,084	2,901
C. Free distribution (including samples) by mail, carrier delivery, or by other means.	252	113
D. Total No. of copies distributed. (Sum of lines B1, B2 and C)	8,439	8,873

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.
LEO HUBERMAN, Business Manager

There is an irony which we all recognize in the fact of America urging us all over the world towards colonial freedom except when it approaches her own doorstep. When I was last in America, in May and June of last year (1963), I discussed with many people, including President Kennedy, this particular question (British Guiana) which weighs heavily on their minds. I myself think their fears are exaggerated. I do not think, for example, that Dr. Jagan himself is a Communist. . . . The American attitude seems to me to be dangerous in this respect. If one puts off independence because one fears that one may get a left-wing government, in my experience, the most likely thing to happen is that one will get a government still further to the Left.

—*Iain Macleod, former Conservative Colonial Secretary, in the House of Commons. (Hansard, April 27, 1964, col. 109.)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

prepublication price which is sometimes as low as 40 percent off; (2) through giving readers who become members of the Associates a discount of 50 percent *off the list price* on any MR Press book at any time (Have *you* joined the Associates? If you are a book buyer, it would certainly pay you to join); (3) through our annual Christmas Sale of books when there is a marked discount on many of our titles. The Christmas Sale is on right now. It will last until December 31, 1964, after which all our titles will go back to their list price. We urge you to look again at the MR Press catalogue which was sent to our North American readers recently, then turn to the double spread in this issue on pages 440-441 and select the books you want at the greatly reduced prices, and send in your order right away. If you already have the books in your own library, we hope you will think of ordering our books for Christmas presents for your friends.

The circulation of MR goes up slowly each year. We don't have the funds necessary for large-scale advertising for new readers. Once we get a reader, we usually keep him (our annual renewal rate is far greater than that of most magazines), but the difficulty lies in getting new subscribers. For that we must rely on those of our readers who think MR is doing a good job. On the back cover of this issue we give reduced rates for new subscriptions—we hope you will help by selling, or giving, a new sub to a friend who should be a reader of MR. For each new sub you send in, we will give you your choice of any one of the following as a gift to you for your cooperation:

Notes from China by Joan Robinson
Burning Conscience by Eatherly and Anders
Capitalism Yesteday and Today by Maurice Dobb
The Communist Manifesto

And to each *new* subscriber we will give, free, the July-August issue which was the book entitled *The Ordeal of British Guiana.*

Our good friend, Jim Aronson, editor of the *National Guardian,* sends us the following letter he received recently, pertaining to Harvey O'Connor's book, *Revolution in Seattle*:

> I came to New York with my daughter and her husband to see the World's Fair. Someone gave me your paper, and I read the story of the Seattle Revolution. I am an old lumberjack 79 years old. I bought a copy of the book, sat up half of the night reading. I was an I.W.W. from 1910 to 1923. O'Connor tells the truth in his good book. I bought another copy for old friends to read when I go home tomorrow.

Hank Mayer, a long-time friend of Scott Nearing and MR, writes that for the education classes and labor library he is setting up for the United Furniture Workers union in the South, he needs books "on labor and all social questions" as well as back numbers of MR. Readers who care to contribute the books and magazines should send them directly to C. H. Mayer, United Furniture Workers, 744 N. Main, Sumter, South Carolina.

Political education to begin with, and political action to come is the goal of the Socialist Forum recently established in Houston, the city reported to have the nation's highest percentage of Birchers. Texas readers who want to attend meetings, or socialist academicians, speakers, etc. who want to talk to Houstonians, should contact Cynthia Letts Adcock, 1820 Ewing #8, Houston 4. Texas.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If you agree that a sub to MR makes an

Ideal Christmas Gift

then consider these offers:

one gift sub for $5
you save $1

two gift subs for $9.50
you save $2.50

three gift subs for $14
you save $4

four gift subs for $17.50
you save $6.50

five gift subs for $20
you save $10

(for each sub outside the U.S. add $1)

We will enclose a gift card signed as you direct.

These offers end on December 31; after that date the rates go back to $6 for a one-year sub in the U.S.; $7 outside the U.S.

Remember: every gift sub you send to a friend is, at the same time, a gift to MR.

And remember, too, that these special rates apply ONLY TO NEW SUBS, NOT TO RENEWALS.

Send your order, with payment enclosed to:

Monthly Review 333 Sixth Avenue New York 10014

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED